economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. A certification statement to this effect was published in the Federal Register of May 4, 1981 (46 FR 24950).

Authority: 21 U.S.C. 346a(j).

List of Subjects

Environmental protection, Administrative practice and procedure, Agricultural commodities, Pesticides and pests, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

Dated: September 6, 1995.

Peter Caulkins, Acting

Director, Registration Division, Office of Pesticide Programs.

[FR Doc. 95–23712 Filed 9–26–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–F

[PP 3G4272/T680; FRL 4975–4]

Sulfentrazone; Establishment of a Temporary Tolerance

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: EPA has established a temporary tolerance for residues of the herbicide sulfentrazone in or on the raw agricultural commodity soybeans at 0.05 part per million (ppm).

DATES: This temporary tolerance expires January 1, 1997.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: By mail: Joanne Miller, Product Manager (PM) 23, Registration Division (7505C), Office of Pesticide Programs, Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M St., SW., Washington, DC 20460. Office location and telephone number: Rm. 237, CM#2, 1921 Jefferson Davis Highway, Arlington, VA, (703) 305–7830; e-mail: miller.joanne@epamail.epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: FMC Corporation, Agricultural Chemical Group, 1735 Market St., Philadelphia, PA 19103, has requested in pesticide petition (PP) 3G4272, the establishment of a temporary tolerance for residues of the herbicide sulfentrazone *N*-[2,4-dichloro-5-[4-(difluoromethyl)-4,5-dihydro-3-methyl-5-oxo-1*H*-1,2,4-triazol-1-yl]phenyl]methanesulfonamide in or on the raw agricultural commodity soybeans at 0.05 part per million (ppm). This temporary tolerance will permit the marketing of the above raw agricultural commodity when treated in accordance with the provisions of the experimental use permits 279-EUP-131, and 279-EUP-134, which are being issued under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA), as amended (Pub. L. 95–396, 92 Stat. 819; 7 U.S.C. 136).

The scientific data reported and other relevant material were evaluated, and it was determined that establishment of the temporary tolerance will protect the public health. Therefore, the temporary tolerance has been established on the condition that the pesticide be used in accordance with the experimental use permits and with the following provisions:

1. The total amount of the active ingredient to be used must not exceed the quantity authorized by the experimental use permits.

2. FMC Corparoation must immediately notify the EPA of any findings from the experimental uses that have a bearing on safety. The company must also keep records of production, distribution, and performance and on request make the records available to any authorized officer or employee of the EPA or the Food and Drug Administration.

This tolerance expires January 1, 1997. Residues not in excess of this amounts remaining in or on the raw agricultural commodity after this expiration date will not be considered actionable if the pesticide is legally applied during the term of, and in accordance with, the provisions of the experimental use permits and temporary tolerance. This tolerance may be revoked if the experimental use permits are revoked or if any experience with or scientific data on this pesticide indicate that such revocation is necessary to protect the public health.

The Office of Management and Budget has exempted this notice from the requirement of section 3 of Executive Order 12866.

Pursuant to the requirements of the Regulatory Flexibility Act (Pub. L. 96–354, 94 Stat. 1164, 5 U.S.C. 601–612), the Administrator has determined that regulations establishing new tolerances or raising tolerance levels or establishing exemptions from tolerance requirements do not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. A certification statement to this effect was published in the Federal Register of May 4, 1981 (46 FR 24950).

Authority: 21 U.S.C. 346a(j).

List of Subjects

Environmental protection, Administrative practice and procedure, Agricultural commodities, Pesticides and pests, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

Dated: September 7, 1995.

Stephen L. Johnson,

Director, Registration Division, Office of Pesticide Programs.

[FR Doc. 95–23715 Filed 9–26–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–F

[OPP–30108; FRL–4974–4]

Denial of Administrative Exception Request to Worker Protection Standard Early-Entry Prohibition for Hand Harvest of Cantaloupe and Squash in Chlorothalonil-Treated Fields

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Denial of administrative exception.

SUMMARY: EPA is denying the State of Delaware's exception request for early entry into chlorothalonil-treated fields to allow hand labor harvesting of cantaloupes and squash 24 hours after application. In this decision, EPA is also denying an exception to Florida, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Maryland, Michigan, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, and Virginia, for all crops that were requested during the public comment period for Delaware's proposal. Under § 170.112(e) of the Worker Protection Standards (WPS), EPA may establish additional exceptions to the WPS provision of prohibiting early entry to perform routine hand labor tasks. The Agency grants or denies a request for an exception based on a risk-benefit analysis. Chlorothalonil, a wettable granular fungicide, has eye and skin irritation concerns and other kidney effects. It has also been classified a probable human carcinogen. In consideration of increased risks associated with performing early entry hand labor tasks on chlorothalonil-treated crops, and incomplete economic benefits information, the Agency has determined that the risks outweigh the benefits of allowing early entry into chlorothalonil-treated fields for hand harvest activities.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Sara Ager or Ameesha Mehta, Office of Pesticide Programs (7506C), Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M St., SW., Washington, DC 20460. Office location, telephone number, and e-mail address: Rm. 1121, 1921 Jefferson Davis Highway, Crystal Mall #2, Arlington, VA, (703–305–7371), e-mail: ager.sara@epamail.epa.gov. or mehta.ameesha@epamail.epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background

A. Worker Protection Standard

On August 21, 1992 (57 FR 38102), EPA issued a final rule revising the Worker Protection Standard (WPS) for agricultural pesticides (40 CFR part 170). The WPS became fully implemented on January 1, 1995. The 1992 WPS expanded the scope of the original WPS to include not only workers performing hand labor operations in fields treated with pesticides, but also workers in or on farms, forests, nurseries, and greenhouses, as well as handlers who mix, load, apply, or otherwise handle pesticides for use at these locations in the production of agricultural commodities. The WPS contains requirements for training, notification of pesticide applications, use of personal protective equipment (PPE), restricted entry intervals (REIs), decontamination, and emergency medical assistance.

B. WPS Early-Entry Restrictions

The 1992 WPS includes provisions under § 170.112 prohibiting agricultural workers from entering a pesticide-treated area to perform routine hand labor tasks during a REI. The WPS defines hand labor as any agricultural activity performed by hand or with hand tools that causes a worker to have substantial contact with treated surfaces (such as plants or soil) that may contain pesticide residues. The REI is the time after the end of a pesticide application during which entry into the treated area is restricted.

C. WPS Exceptions to Early-Entry Restrictions

The WPS currently contains exceptions to the general prohibition against worker entry during the REI for the following purposes: (a) Entry resulting in no contact with treated surfaces; (b) entry allowing short-term tasks (less than 1 hour) to be performed with PPE and other protections; and, (c) entry to perform tasks associated with agricultural emergencies. Under these exceptions, workers engaging in early-entry work are not permitted to engage in hand labor.

Under § 170.112(e) of the WPS, EPA may establish additional exceptions to the Standard's provision of prohibiting early entry to perform routine hand labor tasks. EPA will grant or deny a request for an exception based on a risk-benefit analysis. On June 10, 1994 (59 FR 30265), EPA granted an exception which allows, under specified conditions, early entry into pesticide-treated areas in greenhouses to harvest cut roses. In the Federal Register of May 3, 1995 (60 FR 21953), two additional exceptions have been granted which allow early-entry to perform irrigation and limited contact tasks under specified conditions.

D. Delaware's Petition for an Exception

The State of Delaware petitioned the Agency, under § 170.112(e), to allow early entry by workers into chlorothalonil-treated cantaloupe and squash fields to perform hand labor harvesting 24 hours after the spray application. Chlorothalonil is an agricultural fungicide used to control Downey mildew and other fungal diseases. The existing label REI is 48 hours. The pre-harvest interval (PHI) for melons and squash is zero days. The PHI is the time that must elapse, in days, from the last day of application to the first day that a crop can be harvested. Delaware's petition states that if growers cannot harvest daily they will suffer substantial economic losses. The time period requested was from July 1 through September 15, 1995.

1. *Need for early entry.* According to the petition, cantaloupe and squash are under severe disease pressure from Downey mildew in Delaware, which if unchecked, can destroy the crop. Standard practice is to make preventive (prophylactic) applications of chlorothalonil every 7 days where Downy mildew is a problem. Delaware contends that considerable quantities of fruit could be damaged or lost during a 48–hour REI, due to the inability to harvest mature crops. The alternatives to chlorothalonil are maneb or penncozeb, both of which have a PHI of 5 days. Chlorothalonil has a PHI of zero days, and therefore is used in order to accommodate daily harvesting for fresh market. Under the 48–hour REI, growers must wait 2 days to harvest. Under the requested early-entry exception, growers would only have to wait 24 hours after application to begin harvesting. Delaware contends that regardless of how a grower schedules sprays, there would be a 48–hour REI following a spray application, and weather and crop maturity may require harvest during that time. According to Delaware, the average plot size is 1 acre and will require two to five workers 1 hour to harvest. Workers can harvest several fields over an 8–hour day. Machine harvesting of cantaloupe or squash is not currently feasible.

2. *Proposed terms of exception request.* The State of Delaware proposed the following protective measures:

(a) No harvesting would be performed until 24 hours after application.

(b) Growers harvesting cantaloupe and squash between 24 and 48 hours following the application of chlorothalonil would provide oral warnings to workers to avoid contacting their eyes with their hands and forearms or any clothing which may be in contact with the foliage during the harvest. They would give this warning at the start of each workday.

(c) Workers would be given instructions at the beginning of the workday to wash their hands, forearms, and faces after every 2 hours or at the conclusion of a harvest period if less than 2 hours.

(d) To accommodate the increased use of water at the field decontamination site, the grower would provide 3 gallons of water or have running water available, as opposed to the WPS recommendation of 1 gallon of water per worker.

The State of Delaware concludes that the costs of these measures are inconsequential when compared with the expected loss in the crop value.

3. *Economic impact.* The exception request estimates that 450 acres of cantaloupe and squash production are potentially affected by the Downey mildew disease in Delaware. Based on Delaware's 1993 statistics, the revenue amount for cantaloupe is $2,250 per acre. The inability to harvest in time would result in decreased revenue per acre.

II. Summary of Comments Recieved and Major Issues

EPA received numerous comments on the proposed exception. Comments were received from State agencies, grower groups, farm worker groups, EPA regions and individuals. A summary of the major issues and EPA's response are provided below.

A. Additional States

During the public comment period, the following States petitioned to be included under Delaware's early-entry exception request: Florida, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Maryland, Michigan, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, and Virginia. These States asked for the early-entry exception to be granted for several crops, including cantaloupes, cucumbers, cucurbits, snap beans, squash, stone fruits, and tomatoes. The State of Missouri commented that it did not want to be included under the exception, but suggested that a national exception be considered if these requests were scientifically valid and workers could be adequately protected.

B. Economic Need for Exception

The original exception request from the State of Delaware estimated 450 acres of cantaloupe and squash

production potentially affected by the Downey mildew disease. During the comment period, EPA provided Delaware and the other States with a list of questions requesting detailed information on the economics and exposure parameters of early entry during the 48–hour REI. During the comment period, the Agency received similar requests from 10 other States for cantaloupe, squash, and other crops. States provided differing information on economic impacts, length of harvest seasons and acreage treated, but all presented similar scenarios on the frequency of harvesting and chlorothalonil application.

Under the most common scenario and depending on disease pressures, chlorothalonil is applied every 7 days for a period of several weeks and cantaloupe and squash are harvested daily from the treated acreage. Chlorothalonil has a zero day PHI, and with the former REI, the most that growers would have to delay the harvest would be 24 hours. According to Delaware and other States, a delay of more than 24 hours could cause the fruit to become overripe and, consequently, downgraded.

EPA is aware that prices for crops are set by grade and market type, including fresh local markets and bulk processing. Cantaloupes are produced for a fresh market only, their price being determined by the size and quality of the fruit. Squash are graded according to size, width, and quality, and are produced for both fresh market and bulk processing. If the fruit is too ripe when harvested, it will be considered lower grade, and therefore not appropriate for fresh local market. The State of Ohio submitted information on revenue loss for cucumbers of approximately $100 per acre because of lower grading of fruit. Because there is not a market for lower grade cantaloupe, growers could potentially experience a loss in revenue for the 1 day a week they could not harvest. However, according to the Virginia Extension Service, if a good preventive spray schedule is maintained pre-harvest, then chlorothalonil application may not be necessary during the harvest period and losses in cantaloupe production due to the additional 24–hour delay in harvest may not occur. Virginia Extension Service also states that a 2 to 3–year crop rotation practice and the use of disease resistant varieties is important to delay onset of various disease infestations. Furthermore, disease pressures due to varying environmental conditions vary from year to year.

Several States have claimed that significant economic loss may occur if growers must wait until the expiration of the 48–hour REI to harvest. However, no State submitted detailed information that allowed the Agency to quantify or complete a reliable qualitative assessment of the projected economic impacts due to the additional delay of 24 hours. During the comment period, the Agency provided a list of questions to States, which requested incremental yield losses for each 12–hour REI period. The information was requested to assess what yield losses occurred during a 12–hour, 24–hour, and a 48–hour delay in harvest. Additional information was elicited on 5–year historical net and gross revenues, production budgets, and marketing strategies on the crop of concern. This information would aid EPA in assessing if the significant losses in yield were a direct result of the longer 48–hour REI.

Maryland estimated that a maximum of 10 to 15 percent loss of yield would be incurred for both cantaloupe and squash. Although Maryland did not provide any historical data on net and gross revenues to reliably quantify the projected economic impacts, Maryland did estimate that the yield loss was due to an additional 24–hour (1 day) delay in harvest each week which would result in a loss of 1/7 (14 percent) of growers' total production. This yield loss may constitute a higher portion of grower income. Also, the State of Delaware estimated that 50 to 75 percent of grower net revenue would be lost if the exception was not granted. However, also Delaware stated that these substantial losses in grower profit may not occur because growers may choose alternative cash crops to avoid risk.

The Agency did not have historical data (3 to 5 years) on acreage, yields and prices; therefore, the Agency was not able to assess and confirm if yield losses would be due to an additional 24–hour delay in harvest or other factors. Furthermore, cost of production (growers' expenses) and marketing options (growers' revenue) are used to estimate grower profit. However, incomplete information was provided with regards to cost of productions, revenues, and marketing options (e.g., bulk processing, fresh market, and local market) to confirm if growers would experience 50 to 75 percent loss in profits. EPA realizes that States do not normally collect detailed economic information on minor crops, but the information is essential for EPA to base its decision on the required complete risk-benefit analysis. Further discussion of necessary economic information is contained in Unit IV. of this document.

C. Risk to Workers

Several commenters noted that 35 percent of the farm worker population is made up of women and children. Furthermore, children constitute a potentially sensitive population to the risks associated with pesticides. In comments received from the Delaware Rural Ministries, it was stated that a large number of the harvesters of cantaloupe in that State were farm or neighborhood children.

Another commenter noted that growers are experiencing difficulty understanding why there is a need for a 48–hour REI when the PHI is zero days. The commenter also noted that growers do not understand the risk distinction between eating and harvesting chlorothalonil-treated vegetables. The residues that harvesters may contact are far greater than residues a consumer may contact from eating a treated vegetable. Harvesting activities may result in a substantial portion of the body being exposed to chlorothalonil residues found on the foliage. In some cases, harvesting activities may result in the same amount of pesticide exposure as those obtained during handler activities. Additionally, EPA limits the levels of pesticide residue by establishing tolerances on food crops. A tolerance is the legal limit of a pesticide residue allowed in or on a raw agricultural commodity and, in appropriate cases, on processed foods. Appropriately, EPA limits the levels of pesticide residues to workers by establishing REIs for all pesticides which have agricultural uses.

D. Potential Mitigation Options

One commenter noted that the REI is the single most effective way to reduce the risk of farm worker pesticide poisonings and reliance on PPE is the least effective and least practical way to protect field workers. EPA agrees that PPE is less likely to mitigate the risks associated with this exception and may be impractical due to heat stress concerns. The Agency received further numerous comments questioning the feasibility and practicality of these requirements. For instance, many commenters, including the Florida Fruit and Vegetable Association and the Farmworker Justice Fund asserted that the PPE imposed by the label, especially the coveralls and goggles, are too cumbersome and would place an undue hardship on workers performing their tasks. One commenter noted that perspiration and dirt accumulate on the eyewear, thereby hindering the workers' vision. Additionally, the coveralls, when worn in hot, humid climates,

cause worker discomfort and significantly increase the risk of heat-related illnesses. The University of Florida remarked that in their State, the risk of heat stress was a far more real concern than the potential risk of exposure to chlorothalonil residues. Many commenters stated that the level of PPE had a direct effect on a worker's income since workers are paid according to the amount of produce that they harvest and burdensome PPE or heat illness decreases the worker's harvesting speed and efficiency. Consequently, many workers may be reluctant to wear the label-specified PPE. Hence, EPA primarily relied on administrative controls, such as reduction in application rates and limits in time allowed for harvesting in evaluating this exception request. At the present, engineering controls such as mechanical harvesting are not available for cantaloupe and squash production.

The State of Michigan commented that on cantaloupes the average application rate for chlorothalonil is 1.47 pints/acre. Due to the limited efficacy and economic data submitted, the Agency was not able to assess and quantify the impacts to growers of reducing the application rate, the mean expected yield loss if growers use the next best practical means of controlling the pest, or the anticipated impact of not controlling the pest without the use of a pesticide.

III. EPA's Exception Decision

A. EPA's Risk Assessment

Chlorothalonil has acute concerns such as eye and skin irritation. Chlorothalonil exposure also results in adverse kidney effects which appear to be precursors to kidney cancer. EPA has classified chlorothalonil as a probable human (Category B_2) carcinogen. EPA has conducted a preliminary risk assessment utilizing a chlorothalonil dislodgeable foliar residue study on cucumbers. This study was submitted by the registrant to determine an active ingredient based REI. Data indicate that field residues from the high rate of application persist for longer than the REI and would result in unacceptable risks to harvesters.

Based on the exposure information provided by commenters, EPA conducted its preliminary risk assessment using the following assumptions: an 8–hour workday; 70 kg body weight of an adult male; and the appropriate dermal absorption rate for chlorothalonil. Therefore, EPA assumed that only a small percentage of the total residues are absorbed through the skin. EPA then calculated the margin of exposure (MOE) to estimate the potential harmful kidney effects to workers who were exposed to chlorothalonil on a seasonal basis. The MOE is a numerical value that characterizes the degree of safety related to a toxic chemical. EPA's policy for acceptable chlorothalonil exposure is an MOE of 100 or greater. A value of 100 or more provides an acceptable margin of safety to protect workers from potential health risks. For subchronic dermal exposure (between 1 week and several months of harvesting), a no-observed-effect-level (NOEL) of 1.5 mg/kg/day was determined from a subchronic study in rats. The NOEL refers to the dose rate of chemical at which there are no statistically or biologically significant increases in adverse effects in laboratory animals. The MOEs for chlorothalonil were calculated by dividing the NOEL of 1.5 mg/kg/day, by the harvesters' daily exposure (mg/kg/day), and resulted in values significantly less than 100. The exposure resulting from hand labor activities would place male workers at an unacceptably high risk of developing harmful kidney effects. Risks to children and women would be higher.

After consideration of all the comments on potential and feasible mitigation techniques, and EPA's preliminary risk assessment, the only mitigation option that would result in MOEs of 100 or greater was a significant reduction in the maximum allowable application rate. This would mean that the maximum application rate would have to be reduced from 4.0 pts/acre (2.09 lbs ai/acre) to 1.5 pts/acre (0.78 lbs ai/acre).

EPA is further evaluating data necessary to complete its RED for chlorothalonil. The RED is scheduled for completion this year and an increase to the REI may occur with the current maximum label application rate. Upon completion of the RED, EPA will be in a better position to make an accurate determination of worker risks from chlorothalonil for all crops.

B. Economic Analysis

The State of Delaware and the other States requesting this exception have not made a case, based on the submitted data, that entry during the REI to harvest cantaloupes and squash is necessary, and that prohibiting such entry could have a substantial adverse economic impact on growers of these commodities. Incomplete information was submitted in areas such as cost of production, 3 to 5–year historical data on acreage yields and prices, and potential marketing options (e.g., bulk processing, fresh market, and local market). Based on the submitted information, EPA is not able to quantify or complete a reliable qualitative assessment of the projected economic impacts, yield loss and grower profit associated with loss of harvest days. Therefore, EPA could not conclude that cantaloupe and squash growers would suffer a substantial adverse economic impact if early-entry harvesting is not permitted.

C. Delaware Decision

EPA has evaluated the available information on the risks and benefits of granting this exception. Based on its complete review of a preliminary risk assessment, the submitted economic information and the potential mitigation options, EPA has determined that the risks of the exception outweigh the benefits, and has decided to deny the State of Delaware's exception request.

D. Additional States Decision

EPA also received requests for the exception from other States for crops other than cantaloupe and squash, including, cucumbers, cucurbits, muskmelons, snap beans, stone fruits, and tomatoes. EPA is also denying requests from additional States based on the results of the assessment conducted for workers harvesting chlorothalonil-treated squash and cantaloupes in Delaware.

IV. Guidance on Supporting Information for Exception Requests

For similar, but non-WPS, exemption requests such as a section 18 exemption, under 40 CFR 166.22, States are also required to provide detailed economic information. Data used to assess significant economic loss includes, at minimum:

(a) Historical (5–year) net and gross revenues for the crops, including cost of production budgets.

(b) Estimated gross revenues without the proposed pesticide based on the mean expected yield loss if growers use the next best practical means of controlling (rather than on worst-case maximum yield reductions if no alternative control measure is used).

(c) The anticipated impact of not controlling the pest.

EPA is in the process of developing guidance to clarify § 170.112(e) required information that must be submitted by a petitioner requesting an early-entry exception. The Agency is aware that many States do not collect historical yield and revenue information on minor crops. The Agency is further aware that substantial time would be needed to acquire that information. Therefore, EPA will provide guidance on the type,

quality, and degree of specificity of the information that must be submitted by States and commodity groups. It is expected that with experience gained in implementing the WPS, and with the 1995 season to pursue alternative production and marketing practices, the need for early entry will decrease.

List of Subjects

Environmental protection, Occupational safety and health, and Pesticides and pests.

Dated: September 19, 1995.

Lynn R. Goldman,

Assistant Administrator for Prevention, Pesticides and Toxic Substances.

[FR Doc. 95–24003 Filed 9–26–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–F

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Transition Subcommittee of the Public Safety Wireless Advisory Committee; Meeting

AGENCY: The National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA), Larry Irving, Assistant Secretary for Communications and Information, and the Federal Communications Commission (FCC), Reed E. Hundt, Chairman.

ACTION: Notice of the second meeting of the Transition Subcommittee of the Public Safety Wireless Advisory Committee.

SUMMARY: The NTIA and the FCC established a Public Safety Wireless Advisory Committee and Subcommittees to prepare a final report to advise the NTIA and the FCC on operational, technical and spectrum requirements of Federal, state and local Public Safety entities through the year 2010. The establishment of the committee is in the public interest. In accordance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act, Public Law 92–463, as amended, this notice advises interested persons of the meeting of the Transition Subcommittee of the Public Safety Wireless Advisory Committee.

DATES: Monday, October 16, 1995; 9:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m.

ADDRESSES: Fountaine Bleau Hilton Hotel; 4441 Collins Avenue; Miami Beach, Florida; 33140.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The agenda for the second meeting is as follows:

1. Welcoming Remarks
2. Approval of Agenda
3. Administrative Matters
4. Work Program/Organization of Work
5. Meeting Schedule
6. Agenda for Next Meeting
7. Other Business
8. Closing Remarks

The Transition Subcommittee has an open membership. All interested parties are invited to attend and to participate in the Second Meeting of this Subcommittee. This policy will ensure balanced participation.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For information regarding the Transition Subcommittee, contact: Ronnie Rand or Ali Shahnami at 904–322–2500. For general information relating to the Advisory Committee, contact: William Donald Speights, NTIA, at 202–482–1652, or John J. Borkowski, FCC, at 202–418–0680, Co-Designated Federal Officers of the Public Safety Wireless Advisory Committee (PSWAC). You may also obtain more information from the Internet at the Public Safety Wireless Advisory Committee homepage (http://pswac.ntia.doc.gov).

Federal Communications Commission.

Robert H. McNamara,

Chief, Private Wireless Division, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau.

[FR Doc. 95–23991 Filed 9–26–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712–01–M

FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY

Open Meeting, Board of Visitors for the Emergency Management Institute

AGENCY: Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA).

ACTION: Notice of open meeting.

SUMMARY: In accordance with section 10(a)(2) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act, 5 U.S.C. App. 2, FEMA announces the following committee meeting:

Name: Board of Visitors for the Emergency Management Institute.

Dates of Meeting: October 16–17, 1995.

Place: Federal Emergency Management Agency, National Emergency Training Center, Emergency Management Institute, Conference Room, Building N, Emmitsburg, Maryland 21727.

Time: Monday, October 16, 1995, 8:30 a.m.–5:00 p.m.; Tuesday, October 17, 1995, 8:30 a.m.–12:00 noon.

Proposed Agenda: Discuss the board's 1995 Annual Report and 1995 Workplan. The board will devise its 1996 Workplan, and attend sessions regarding EMI's training programs.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The meeting will be open to the public with approximately 10 seats available on a first-come, first-served basis. Members of the general public who plan to attend the meeting should contact the Office of the Superintendent, Emergency Management Institute, 16825 South Seton Avenue, Emmitsburg, MD 21727, (301) 447–1286.

Minutes of the meeting will be prepared and will be available for public viewing in the Office of the Superintendent, Emergency Management Institute, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Building N, National Emergency Training Center, Emmitsburg, MD 21727. Copies of the minutes will be available upon request 30 days after the meeting.

Dated: September 18, 1995.

Kay C. Goss,

Associate Director, Preparedness, Training, and Exercise Directorate.

[FR Doc. 95–23946 Filed 9–26–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6718–01–M

FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION

Ocean Freight Forwarder License; Reissuance of License

Notice is hereby given that the following ocean freight forwarder license has been reissued by the Federal Maritime Commission pursuant to section 19 of the Shipping Act of 1984 (46 U.S.C. app. 1718) and the regulations of the Commission pertaining to the licensing of ocean freight forwarders, 46 CFR Part 510.

License No.	Name/Address	Date Reissued
3216	Express International Cargo Services, Inc., 3405 NW., 72nd Avenue, Building A., Suite 101, Miami, FL 33122.	Aug. 21, 1995.

Bryant L. VanBrakle,

Director, Bureau of Tariffs, Certification and Licensing.

[FR Doc. 95–23909 Filed 9–26–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6730–01–M